

passivation material is constructed and arranged to be at least partially over the metal bond pad and the diffusion layer.

20. *(Amended)* The semiconductor chip of claim 15, wherein the semiconductor chip is configured and arranged as a flip chip.

Remarks

The Office Action mailed December 4, 2002 indicated that claims 5 and 20 stand objected to due to informalities therein; claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; claims 1-4, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bourg, Jr. et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,424,581) in view of *Greer* (U.S. Patent No. 6,451,681); claims 5-8, 10, 11 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the '581 reference in view of the '681 reference as applied to claim 1, and further in view of a "Camilletti et al." reference (for which no patent number was recited); claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the '581 reference in view of the '681 reference and the "Camilletti et al." reference as applied to claim 11 and further in view of *Shangguan et al.* (for which no patent number was recited). No rejection of claims 7, 12, 13 and 16-20 has been made.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's attention to the wording of claims 15 and 20. Applicant has amended each of these claims to correct wording informalities therein. Applicant believes that the amendment to claim 15 overcomes the Section 112, second paragraph rejection because the limitations referred to in the Office Action have been removed. Applicant further believes that the amendment to claim 20 overcomes the objection to claims 5 and 20 because amended claim 20 now depends from claim 15, rather than claim 1. These amendments have been made solely for the purpose of correcting informalities and have not been made for reasons of patentability in view of any prior art.

No statement of rejection was made in connection with claims 7, 12, 13 and 16-20. Instead, the Examiner indicated that the claims were "discussed previously." Applicant submits that this statement is confusing and contrary to 35 U.S.C. §132 and M.P.E.P. §707. Specifically, any rejection maintained for these claims would be improper because the Examiner failed to give